Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1, 2, 16, 17, 18, 25, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph. In response, claims 18 and 27 have been amended and the remaining claims have been cancelled. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 16-18, 25-27 and 34-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Florance (2003/0078897). Regarding claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 16, 17, 25 and 26, the rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of those claims. Regarding the remaining claims, those claims are patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants' invention, as recited by claim 3, includes a feature which is neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

> ...storing a request for delivery of the content...the delivery request...including...a content identifying information comprised of an arbitrary character string specified by the user...

This feature is described, for example, in page 8, line 25, through page 9, line 10, of the originally filed application. As explained in Applicants' specification, this information is useful to the user when the user attempts to classify and select e-mails.

The Official Action states that this feature is disclosed in Florance. Applicants' representative has carefully reviewed Florance and has not found any disclosure which corresponds to Applicants' claimed feature. The Office is respectfully requested to either clearly state column and line number in the prior reference which corresponds to this feature or to withdraw the rejection. As Applicants' representative has not found this feature in the prior art reference, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 9 include the features of claim 3 from which they depend. Thus, claims 4 and 9 are also patentable over the art of record.

Claims 18, 27 and 34, while not identical to claim 3, are also patentable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 3.

Claims 35-38 include the features of claim 34 from which they depend. Thus, claims 35-38 are also patentable over the art of record.

Claims 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florance in view of Sealand (2003-0014402). Claims 6 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being upatentable over Florance. Claims 7-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being obvious over Florance. Regarding claims 7 and 8, the rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of those claims. Regarding the remaining claims, those claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claims.

It is noted that some features included in Applicants' claims are supported by Applicants' Fig. 5. It is understood that the process shown in Applicants' Fig. 5 is merely exemplary and may be modified in such a way that step S504 is performed prior to step S503 and, if the process is within the delivery validity period, the process can proceed to step S505.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicants

LEA/dmw
Dated: September 16, 2005

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on September 16, 2005.

Donna M. Wellings

DMW_I:\MAT\8204US\AMEND02.DOC